REMARKS

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1 and 4 have been amended. Claims 6-27 have been cancelled. Claims 1-5 are pending and under consideration.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 112

Claims 1-5 were rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Specifically, independent claims 1 and 4 were rejected because the limitation of "a file" is unclear. Claims 1 and 4 have been appropriately amended to clarify that separate files for each functional component of the device driver and a user interface are generated.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejection is requested.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 102

Claims 1-5 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Gomez et al. (US 7,106,472) (hereinafter "Gomez").

Claims 1-3

Amended claim 1 recites: "...generating separate files for each functional component of the device driver and a user interface; making a device driver installation program by rebuilding only the file corresponding to the functional component to be modified when a modification of a functional component is needed; and reconstructing information on the device drive to be installed using the file corresponding to the functional component selected by a user on the device driver installation program and generating the device driver using the reconstructed information on the device driver."

The Office Action relies on Gomez to show the features of claim 1. Specifically, the Office Action relies on Figures 2 and 3 of Gomez and the whole text of Gomez.

According to amended claim 1, the present invention discloses "making a device driver installation program by rebuilding only the file corresponding to the functional component to be modified when a modification of a functional component is needed." However, it is respectfully submitted that Gomez does not disclose this feature.

Regarding the feature of claim 1 of generating separate files for each functional component of the device driver and a user interface, the Examiner notes that this feature is anticipated by the base module 24 and extended module 26 in Gomez. However, in its currently

amended form, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 clearly patentably distinguishes over Gomez because Gomez only discusses only discusses modules formed within a single file rather than generating separate files for each component as recited in claim 1.

As has been previously argued, an example of the difference between the present invention as recited in claim 1 and Gomez may be seen by referring to Figure 4 of Gomez. In Figure 4 of Gomez, a print dialog menu 36 typically includes a plurality of property sheets 38, accessible via selectors such as tabs. The property sheets display general attributes 40 of print job 38 common to all printing devices, such as the number of copies, or the page range of the document to be printed. The user may adjust values for these attributes via selectors 42. The property sheets further include user-adjustable printer-specific attributes 44, such as user-adjustable base attributes 46, and user-adjustable extended attributes 50. User-adjustable base attributes 46 are typically adjustable by a user via selector 48, while user-adjustable extended attributes 50 are typically adjustable via selector 52. It will be understood that user-adjustable base attributes 46 and user-adjustable extended attributes 50 are subsets of base attributes 16 and extended attributes 18, respectively, since not all of base attributes 16 and extended attributes 18 are typically adjustable by a user. See Gomez, 3:48-3:64 and Figure 4.

Specifically, in Gomez a user is required to sift through all of the various adjustable attributes to set up the print driver. By contrast, claim 1 recites generating **separate** files for each functional component of the device driver and a user interface, and then the method of claim 1 reconstructs information on the device drive to be installed using the file corresponding to the functional component selected by a user on the device driver installation program and generating the device driver using the reconstructed information on the device driver. Gomez does not discuss a method or apparatus capable of allowing a user to directly select a separate file representing only a functional component to be modified from among all of the functional components of a device driver through a user interface, where the selected functional component can then be independently modified, and then the modified result can be reflected onto the entire device driver. This technical aspect of claim 1 allows a user to flexibly install and use a printer driver.

Claims 2 and 3 depend on claim 1 and are therefore believed to be allowable for at least the foregoing reasons.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejection is requested.

Claims 4 and 5

Amended claim 4 recites: "...an installation program maker which generates separate files for each functional component of the device driver and a user interface and makes a device driver installation program by rebuilding only the file corresponding to a functional component to be modified when a modification of a functional component is need; and a driver generator which reconstructs information on the device driver to be installed using the file corresponding to the functional component selected by a user on the device driver installation program and generates an update to the device driver using the reconstructed information on the device driver." The Office Action relies on Gomez to show these features of claim 4. However, it is respectfully submitted that print driver of Gomez only discusses a single print dialog menu 36 that does not include a driver generator which reconstructs information on the device driver to be installed using the file corresponding to the functional component selected by a user on the device driver installation program and generates an update to the device driver using the reconstructed information on the device driver as recited in claim 4.

Claim 5 depends on claim 4 and is therefore believed to be allowable for at least the foregoing reasons.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejections is requested.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: June 23, 2008

By: Gregory W. Harper
Gregory W. Harper
Registration No. 55,248

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501